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Minutes for the 802.11me – REVme April 2024 AdHoc held at the Qualcomm offices in San Diego, California.

1. **REVme 2024 April AdHoc – San Diego – Tuesday AM1 - April 16, 2024 10:00 -12:00 PDT**
   1. **Called to order** 10.04 am MT by the Chair TGme, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Introductions of** Officers present:
      1. Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
      2. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
      3. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
      4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
   3. **Attendance for Tuesday**: -- IMAT report for someone attending some portion of Tuesday’s meetings:
      1. IMAT Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | Halasz, David | Morse Micro |
| 3 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4 | Hart, Brian | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 5 | Hedayat, Ahmadreza | Apple Inc. |
| 6 | Huang, Po-Kai | Intel |
| 7 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 8 | Kneckt, Jarkko | Apple, Inc. |
| 9 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 10 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 11 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 12 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 13 | Ptasinski, Henry | Element78 Communications LLC |
| 14 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 15 | Raissinia, Alireza | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 16 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 17 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 18 | Shellhammer, Stephen | Qualcomm Incorporated |
| 19 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |
| 21 | Talarico, Salvatore | Sony Corporation |

* + 1. Webex Report on individuals attending that are missing in IMAT Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Tianyu Wu | Apple |
| 2 | Sid Thakur | Apple |
| 3 | SK Yong | Apple |
| 4 | Yong Liu | Apple |
| 5 | Subir Das | Peraton Labs |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy/Copyright Policy**
     1. No Issues noted.
  2. **Review Agenda**
     1. See Doc 11-24/626r4:
        1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0626-04-000m-revme-april-2024-adhoc-agenda.docx>
     2. Remove 7a from Mark RISON.
     3. CID 6149 needs a reversal – Mark RISON to follow-up with Emily QI.
     4. CID 7195 needs to be scheduled for discuss.
     5. Doc 11-24/702r0: CIDs 7166, 7220, 7199/7200, 7201, 7160, 7213 ready to present – scheduled Thursday PM1
     6. Graham SMITH has outstanding presentation, but not scheduled.
        1. Clause 6 – CIDs 7081, 7077, 7071 – doc 11-24/566 – Add Thursday AM1.
     7. Update Agenda posted as 11-24/626r5
        1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0626-05-000m-revme-april-2024-adhoc-agenda.docx>
     8. No Objection for approving updated agenda.
  3. **Editor Report:** No Editor online
  4. **Review doc 11-24/572r2** Jouni MALINEN (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0572-02-000m-various-revme-sa-recirc-comments.docx>
     2. CID 7007 (SEC):
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review submission discussion.
        3. Review proposed changes.
        4. Update some minor wording changes.
        5. Use of doze-state as a generic term.
        6. Change “wakes” up to ‘transitions to the awake state”.
        7. Discussion on use of “expected”.
        8. Discussion on how the AP handles PM states.
        9. Discussion on the direction of the KEYERROR box and what text would be better used.
        10. Use of “Conditionally, Disconnect = True” in the box and then use the updated text to be added to the draft.
        11. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (SEC: 2024-04-16 16:54:09Z) - Incorporate the changes in11-24/0572r3 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0572-03-000m-various-revme-sa-recirc-comments.docx> ) for CID 7007.
        12. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 7025 (MAC)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  5. **Review Doc 11-24/0342r3,** Henry PTASINSKI (Element 78)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0342-03-000m-multipurpose-alternate-replay-counters.docx>
     2. CID 7028 (SEC):
        1. Review comment...
        2. Discussion on the proposed changes.
        3. Changes proposed may need some work done in 802.11bf.
  6. **Review Doc 11-24/682r0,** Po-Kai HUANG (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0682-00-000m-cr-for-cid-7028.docx>
     2. Also, CID 7028 (SEC)
        1. Review alternative solution.
        2. Discussion on the wording of the bit masking or not.
        3. Confusion on how Bits 0-9 of the Sequence control field are in the Sequence Number subfield.
        4. Discussion on SC – MPDU Sequence Control field paragraph.
        5. There are two different areas of changes, the one that Po-Kai is addressing is a subset of what Henry was proposing. Po-Kai does not believe they are related.
        6. Henry believes that the AID processing needed to be addressed once and it touches this paragraph. Trying to avoid a one-off solution instead of a more generic complete approach.
        7. After protracted discussion, the chair determined that a straw poll should be run.
        8. Straw Poll:
           1. To resolve CID 7028, do you prefer:

A. Unmasking the ACI in the Sequence Number Subfield(11-24/682)

B. Add the ACI to the end of the

C. Disallow QMF when GC

* + - * 1. Results: 4,3,2
      1. Retry the straw poll with just A and B as option.
      2. Results: 9-2
      3. Proposed Resolution: Revised.
      4. Request to review the document again.
      5. Assign to Po-Kai
      6. Mark CID More Work Required.
      7. Schedule for April 29, 2024 Telecon
      8. Request editorial comments be sent to Po-Kai.
  1. **Review doc 11-24/648r0** – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0648-00-000m-sa2-security-comment-resolutions.docx>
     2. CID 7231 (SEC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. Modified the note at 3029.40 and 3043.21, changing:  
           “NOTE 1—The number indicated by the TDLS responder STA (if a TDLS Discovery Response frame is sent) is ignored, as is the GTKSA Replay Counter field in the TDLS Setup Request frame and any TDLS Discovery Response frame.”  
           to  
           “NOTE 1— The number of replay counters, the GTKSA Replay Counter, and Extended Key ID For Individually Addressed Frames fields indicated are ignored in the TDLS Setup Request frame  and any TDLS Discovery Response frame.”  
             
           Note To Editor: Number the notes appropriately at the cited locations.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     3. CID 7161 (SEC)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Review proposed changes.
        4. Does the “shall” apply to only first verb or to all the verbs.
        5. Straw poll: Do you think the “shall” at 3107.26 applies to all of the verbs in the bullets of the list.
           1. A. yes
           2. B. No
           3. C. Abstain
           4. Results: 5-3-1
        6. Continue to discuss if the “shall” applies.
        7. Assign the comment to Mark RISON
        8. Need to make sure that the verbs that need to be “shall-ified”.
        9. If we need a shall for a particular verb.
        10. Schedule for Thursday PM1.
        11. Mark More Work Required.
     4. CIDs 7232 - 7237 (SEC):
        1. Review the comments.
        2. There were some feedback comments that came in late but have not had a chance to apply them.
        3. Review the proposed changed text and try to catch the editorial changes.
        4. Discussion on the inclusion of “FTE, or TIE” in both locations.
        5. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 7232 -7237 (SEC): Incorporate the changes in 11-24/0648r1(<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0648-01-000m-sa2-security-comment-resolutions.docx>).
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     5. CID 7152 (SEC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Discussion on the proposed change.
        4. Discussion on accepting the comment as is.
        5. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
     6. CID 7163 (SEC)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Discussion on if there are some TPK transient key locations that are correct. Would use of the acronym help readability?
        4. Review other changes for accuracy of use of TPKSA and TPK-TK.
        5. Discussion on if TPK is a key or procedure. Line 8 says that TPK is a transient key.
        6. There are also a set of TPK usages that have a different meaning. However, these changes make an improvement.
        7. Review and make requested editorial changes.
        8. Proposed Resolution: REVISED. The TPK transient key is composed of the TPK-KCK and the TPK-TK, where the TPK-TK is the TPK temporal key. This is consistent terminology with the PTK.  
             
           At 3118.21, change   
           “The TPK transient key (TPK-TK) shall be computed”   
           to   
           “The TPK temporal key (TPK-TK) shall be computed”  
             
           At 3073.26, change  
           “When two multi-band capable devices operate in a non-DMG BSS and set up a TDLS direct link in the BSS, the TPK handshake protocol can be used to create a PTKSA for use in another supported band/channel that is supported by both STAs and that was indicated in the Multi-band element in each of the STAs. Only TK in PTKSA is required for the supported band/channel and it shall be equal to the TPK-TK of the TPK.”   
           to  
           “When two multi-band capable devices operate in a non-DMG BSS and set up a TDLS direct link in the BSS, the TPK handshake protocol can be used to create a TPKSA for use in another supported band/channel that is supported by both STAs and that was indicated in the Multi-band element in each of the STAs. Only the TPK-TK in the TPKSA is required for the supported band/channel.”  
             
           At 3073.34, change  
           “In this case, the TPK creation method shall be used to calculate a different PTKSA in  
           the supported band/channel:”   
           to  
           “In this case, the TPK transient key derivation shall be used to calculate a different TPKSA in the supported band/channel:”  
             
           At 3118.43, change  
           “derive the TPK and attack …”   
           to  
           “derive the TPK transient key and attack …”  
             
           At 3118.63, change   
           “… generate the TPK.”   
           to   
           “… generate the TPK transient key”  
             
           At 3120.60 change  
           “…compute the TPK”  
           to   
           “…compute the TPK transient key”.
        9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     7. Return to CID 7231 (SEC)
        1. Concern that the TDLS Setup Request Frame is not ignored.
        2. The restructuring of the text seemed to cause more trouble with consensus.
        3. After a brief discussion, it was determined to change the resolution to Accept.
        4. Updated Resolution; Accepted.
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
  2. **Recess 12:00**

1. **REVme AdHoc – Tuesday PM1 13:00 to 15:00**
   1. **Called to order** at 13:02pm PDT by Mike
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No Issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda**
      1. 11-24/626r4
      2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0626-04-000m-revme-april-2024-adhoc-agenda.docx>
      3. Changes added for Wednesday and Thursday discussed.
      4. No objection to updated Agenda.
   4. **Review doc 11-24/702r0** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-00-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx>
      2. CID 7198 (ED1)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Found many instances of abbreviation to correct.
         3. Discussion on which format of units should be noted.
         4. Follow the IEEE Standard is the plan going forward.
         5. Proposed Resolution: REVISED  
            At 980.2 change  
            The top of the building is 67.4 meters above sea level, and a starting altitude of 0 meters above sea level is assumed.  
            to  
            The top of the building is 67.4 m above sea level, and a starting altitude of 0 m above sea level is assumed.  
              
            At 1000.41 change  
            NOTE 5—Seven decimal places of latitude and longitude provide sufficient resolution to achieve under 0.01 meters of latitude error and longitude error throughout the globe. Considering the sizes of devices whose positions are being estimated and the use cases for the estimated positions, a map georegistration error of under 0.01 meters is generally regarded as sufficient to avoid compromise of the estimated positions.(#6068)  
            to  
            NOTE 5—Seven decimal places of latitude and longitude provide sufficient resolution to achieve under 0.01 m of latitude error and longitude error throughout the globe. Considering the sizes of devices whose positions are being estimated and the use cases for the estimated positions, a map georegistration error of under 0.01 m is generally regarded as sufficient to avoid compromise of the estimated positions.(#6068)  
              
            At 2634.7 change  
            the user interface might retrieve the map image and display it from (–50, –100) to (49.9, 0) meters, place a pin at (0, 0) meters labelled “Lobby Entrance”, and place a second pin at (0, –1.5) meters labelled “You Are Here”.  
            to  
            the user interface might retrieve the map image and display it from (–50 m, –100 m) to (49.9 m, 0 m), place a pin at (0 m, 0 m) labelled “Lobby Entrance”, and place a second pin at (0 m, –1.5 m) labelled “You Are Here”.  
            At 1118.2 change “1 microsecond units” to “1 <micro>s units”.  
            At 1228.37 change “50 milliseconds” to “50 ms”.  
              
            At 2025.6 change “8 microsecond” to “8 <micro>s”.  
              
            At 2465.26, 2478.38 change “231–1 microseconds” to “231–1 <micro>s”.  
              
            At 2653.55 change “30 seconds” to “30 s”.  
              
            At 2911.51, 5294.41, 5296.62, 5347.24 change “60 seconds” to “60 s”.  
              
            At 3119.24 change “300 seconds” to “300 s”.  
              
            At 3136.45 change “five seconds” to “5 s”.  
              
            At 3136.61 change “5 seconds” to “5 s”.  
              
            At 3340.17 change “1 microsecond” to “1 <micro>s”.  
              
            At 3556.41, 3557.60, 3935.29, 3936.47 change “100 nanosecond” to “100 ns”.  
              
            At 3881.34/57 change “1 microsecond” to “1 <micro>s”.  
              
            At 3965.52 change “100 picosecond” to “100 ps”.  
              
            At 4490.52 change “0.1 nanosecond” to “100 ps”.  
              
            At 4892.27 change “10 nanosecond” to “10 ns”.  
              
            At 5296.29, 5346.57 change “32 seconds” to “32 s”.  
              
            At 5296.46 change “256 seconds” to “256 s”.  
              
            At 5347.9 change “512 seconds” to “512 s”.  
              
            At 5575.5 change “1stream” to “1 stream”.
         6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
      3. CID 7165 (ED2)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review Proposed changes.
         3. Proposed Resolution: Accepted
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
   5. **Review doc 11-24/683r0** - Joseph LEVY (InterDigital)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0683-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-7136.docx>
      2. CID 7136 (ED1)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review the redline changes.
         3. Changed (2 places) "Octets" to "octets"
         4. C: We could also delete the second sentence of the second paragraph, as no longer needed.
         5. Proposed Resolution: CID 7136 (ED1): Revised. Incorporate the changes shown in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0683-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-7136.docx>
         6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   6. **Review Document: 11-24/0684r0 -** Joseph LEVY (InterDigital)
      1. [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0684-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-cids-7117-and-7118.docx](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0684-00-000m-proposed-resolutions-for-cids-7117-and-7118.docx )

* + 1. CIDs 7117 and 7118 (ED2):
       1. Review comment...s
          1. From the Denver Minutes:  
             5.8.8     CID 7118 (ED2)  
             5.8.8.1    Review comment...  
             5.8.8.2    Proposed Resolution: Accepted  
             5.8.8.3    No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion  
               
             5.8.9     CID 7117 (ED2)  
             5.8.9.1    Review comment...  
             5.8.9.2    Assign CID to Joe Levy.   
             5.8.9.3    Mark More work required.   
             5.8.9.4    Schedule April REVme AdHoc
       2. Review reason for not accepting during the March Plenary
          1. The following was the reason Jouni opposed: "? I don't remember all the details from the discussion, but I'm pretty sure I objected to the "to a different BSS" part, and we discussed various other possible approaches with (re)association and removing BSS and/or ESS. I don'trecall us having concluded on specific language to use."
       3. Definition: "basic service set (BSS) transition: [BSS transition] Change of association by a station (STA) from one BSS to another BSS in the same extended service set (ESS)."
       4. One alternative, "a STA BSS transitioning" --> "a STA reassociating"
       5. Discussion on when a BSS transition takes place, is it to a different BSS or could it be the same BSS.
       6. Concern with the definition of BSS transition.
       7. Change to use just “Reassociation”.
       8. Proposed Updated Resolutions:
          1. CID 7117: Revised: Replace: "BSS transition by the STA within the ESS" With: "Reassociation"
          2. CID 7118 Revised: Replace: "BSS transition by the STA within the ESS" With: "Reassociation"
       9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Review Doc: 11-24/687r0** - Joseph LEVY (InterDigtal)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0687-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-7021.docx>
     2. CID 7021 (PHY)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Spatial streams should be associated with a single antenna.
        4. The assumption that 11az was using was that there was a one to one association. The maintaining of the power is something that needs to be discussed with the 11az experts.
        5. Marked More Work Required
        6. Schedule for May 6th teleconference
  2. **Review doc 11-24/0685r2** Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0689-02-000m-cids-7218-7219.docx>
     2. The VISO files were included in the submission.
     3. CIDs 7218 (ED2)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7218 (ED2): Revised. Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0689-02-000m-cids-7218-7219.docx>, for CID 7218.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 7219 (ED2)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review proposed changes.
        3. Discussion on the difference for transmitted and non-transmitted BSSID.
        4. More issues with the interpretation of the diagram
        5. There was a proposal to remove “/AID 0”, but not a lot of support for that direction. The removal of that text would not be helpful.
        6. Need feedback on email sent to the reflector.
        7. Mark More Work required.
        8. Schedule for May Interim
  3. **Review doc 11-24/692r0** - ED2 CIDs – Edward AU
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0692-00-000m-proposed-resolution-to-cids-7138-to-7141.docx>
     2. 7138 7139, 7140, 7141(ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review proposed changes.
        3. Review discussion in submission.
        4. Discussion on when we have to expand abbreviation or not.
        5. Expand first time in main text and then again in each Annex is the nominal requirement.
        6. We will accept the ones on the changes in the Annex and reject the first two in main body text.
        7. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 7140 and 7141 (ED2): Accepted.
        8. Proposed Resolution: CIDs 7138, 7139, (ED2): Rejected.  
           The IEEE SA Standards Style Manual tells us:  
           •    Within text, the acronym or abbreviation should follow the first use of the full term (the first time in the introduction, then the first time in the body of the document, and then the first time in any annexes in which the acronym appears).  
             
           The CRC has interpreted this for 802.11, that the preferred ‘rule’ is that an acronym must be shown with expansion at first use in each definition (individually) in clause 3, and then again at first use beyond clause 3, globally (not per major clause).  
           •    RSTA occurs in exactly one definition in clause 3 (Null-SAC-HE-LTF), and it is expanded on first use in that definition.  The first usage after clause 3 is in 4.3.22.19, where it is also expanded.  No problem found.  
           •    ISTA also occurs in exactly one definition in clause 3 (Null-SAC-HE-LTF), and it is expanded on first use in that definition.  The first usage after clause 3 is also in 4.3.22.19, where it is also expanded.  No problem found.
        9. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  4. **Review Doc: 11-24/0649r0** - Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0649-00-000m-proposed-resolution-for-miscellaneous-comments-on-recirculation-sa-ballot-on-d5-0-part-3.docx>
     2. CID 7182 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 7177 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 7004 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     5. CID 7002 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7002 (ED2): Revised. At 1168.15, replace “off channel” with “off-channel”.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     6. CID 7186 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Discussion on what the Management Frames should be capitalized or not.
        3. Protected Management frames vs protected management frames vs management frame protected vs Management frame (protected or unprotected).
        4. Change to “management frames protection.”
        5. Proposed Resolution: Revised At 2698.8, change “protected management frames” to “management frame protection”.
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     7. CID 7186 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     8. CID 7035 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     9. CID 7037 (ED2)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7037 (ED2): Rejected. The grammar is correct. The proposed change would change the meaning of the sentence. The intent is to recommend not do the transmission.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     10. CID 7036 (ED2)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     11. CID 7210 (ED2)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  5. **Recess at 3:07pm PDT**

1. **Tuesday REVme AdHoc PM2 15:15 to 18:00**
   1. **Called to order** at 3:18pm PDT by the Michael MONTEMURRO, Chair (Huawei).
   2. **Review PatCom Policy**
      1. No Issues.
   3. **Review Agenda**
      1. Propose to continue agenda.
      2. No Objection –
   4. **Review Doc: 11-24/0528r7** - Po-Kai HUANG (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0528-07-000m-cr-for-miscellaneous-cids.docx>
      2. CID 7049 (MAC)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. Discussion on “was negotiated” vs “in use”.
         4. Several locations need to add “was”
         5. Question of why the change is made in Clause 9.
            1. Save for another day, but make change to be consistent.
         6. Proposed Resolution: CID 7049 (MAC): Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0528-08-000m-cr-for-miscellaneous-cids.docx>, for CID 7049.
         7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 7050 (SEC)
         1. Review comment...
         2. Review proposed changes.
         3. Discussion on the use of “robust management frames”
         4. 12.2.7 seems to have a conflicting definition.
         5. Beacon protection may not be the same as robust protection.
         6. Need some more discussion offline.
         7. Use the Reflector to get more feedback.
         8. Mark as More Work Required.
         9. Schedule for April 29.
         10. ACTION ITEM #1: Mark HAMILTON to work with Po-Kai on this.
   5. **Review document 11-24/698r0** - Youhan KIM (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0698-00-000m-spatial-mapping-for-he-ranging.docx>
      2. CID 7016 and 7017 (PHY):
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. Review proposed changes.
         4. Discussion of the definition of zero matrix.
         5. “remaining rows shall be a zero matrix” is probably an ok statement.
         6. Discussion on use of Matrix to identify the antenna used.
         7. Editorial changes were also made.
         8. Mark CIDs as more work required.
         9. Schedule for May 6th Telecon.
         10. Please continue the discussion on the reflector.
      3. CID 7018 (PHY):
         1. Review comment...
         2. Review proposed change.
         3. Editorial changes for semi-colon and lower case “if”.
         4. Mark CIDs as more work required.
         5. Schedule for May 6th telecon
         6. CID 7018 (PHY): More Work Required. Assign to Youhan KIM. Bring back on May 6 telecon. (Note: Related to CIDs 7016 and 7017 discussions.)
      4. CID 7020 (PHY):
         1. More Work Required.
         2. Mark Assign to Youhan KIM.
         3. Schedule to Bring back on May 6 telecon.
         4. (Note: Related to CIDs 7016 and 7017 discussions.)
   6. **Review doc 11-24/0697r0** – Steve SHELLHAMMER (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0697-00-000m-cid-7094.docx>
      2. CID 7094 (PHY):
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. Review proposed changes.
         4. Discussion on use of bits “B5 B6, B7”
         5. Discussion on not having the duplicate mapping.
         6. Suggested replacement text : “For purpose of the phase rotation, each octet is mapped so B7 is the most significant bit and B0 is the least significant bit.”7094
         7. Proposed Resolution: CID 7094 (PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0697-00-000m-cid-7094.docx>
         8. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   7. **Review document 11-24/0098r2** - Ali RAISSINIA (Qualcomm)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0098-02-000m-alignment-of-secure-ltf-normative-text-with-test-vectors.docx>
      2. ABSTRACT: This document resolves the discrapency between the normative text associated with generation of Secure-LTF-Key-Seed, SAC-and-LTF-keys and the test vectors specified in section J.14 LTF Sequence Generation Test Vectors
      3. No CID
      4. Review the submission.
      5. No objection to incorporating the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0098-03-000m-alignment-of-secure-ltf-normative-text-with-test-vectors.docx>
   8. . **GEN AdHoc – Discuss CIDs** – Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
      1. CID 7196 (GEN): (from database)
         1. CID 7196 (GEN): Straw Poll: Do you agree HCCA should be deprecated? Y: 4, N: 0, Abs: 3.
         2. To be posted to the reflector, along with the poll results, that we plan to deprecate.
         3. More work required.
         4. Assign to Jon ROSDAHL.
         5. Schedule to bring back on May 6.
      2. CID 7187 (GEN):
         1. CID 7187 (GEN):
         2. Mark CID More work required.
         3. Assign to Mark HAMILTON.
         4. Schedule to bring back this week (along with the other CID on BSA definition).
      3. CID 7056 (GEN):
         1. Same as CID 7059 (GEN), which is assigned to Emily QI, for the April ad hoc.
      4. CID 7056 (GEN):
         1. Mark CID More work required.
         2. Assign to Emily QI.
         3. Scheduled to bring back during April ad hoc.
   9. **Recess at 6:02pm**
2. **REVme 2024 April AdHoc – San Diego – Wednesday AM1 - April 17, 2024, 10:00 -12:00 PDT**
   1. **Called to order** 10.04 am MT by the Chair TGme, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Introductions of** Officers present:
      1. Chair – Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei)
      2. Vice Chair - Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/CommScope)
      3. Vice Chair - Mark RISON (Samsung)
      4. Secretary - Jon ROSDAHL (Qualcomm)
   3. **Attendance for Tuesday**: -- IMAT report for someone attending some portion of Tuesday’s meetings:
      1. IMAT Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Adachi, Tomoko | TOSHIBA Corporation |
| 2 | Asterjadhi, Alfred | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 3 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 4 | Das, Subir | Peraton Labs |
| 5 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 6 | Hart, Brian | Cisco Systems, Inc. |
| 7 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 8 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 9 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 10 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 11 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 12 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 13 | Petrick, Albert | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 14 | Ptasinski, Henry | Element78 Communications LLC |
| 15 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 16 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 17 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 18 | Segev, Jonathan | Intel |
| 19 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |

* + 1. Webex Report on individuals attending that are missing in IMAT Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Dong Wei | NXP Semiconductors |
| 2 | Hui Luo | Infineon |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy/Copyright Policy**
     1. No Issues noted.
  2. **Review Agenda R5**
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0626-05-000m-revme-april-2024-adhoc-agenda.docx>
     2. No changes identified,
     3. No Objection to Agenda plan.
     4. Xin (Huawei) not present. - Reschedule for April 29 Telecon.
  3. **Review doc 11-24/634r0** - CID 7053 (MAC) Stephen MCCANN (Huawei).
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0634-00-000m-cid-7053-comment-resolution.docx>
     2. CID 7053 (MAC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Review Proposed Changes.
        4. See context page 2810.55.
        5. Also, typo on following page 2811.31
        6. Proposed Resolution: CID 7053 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-17 16:10:42Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-24/0634r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0634-00-000m-cid-7053-comment-resolution.docx>)
        7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  4. **MAC Review CIDs** – Mark HAMILTON
     1. CID 7057 (MAC)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review proposed changes.
        3. Proposed Resolution:
           1. CID 7057 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-17 16:17:49Z): Assign an Element ID extension for the TWT Constraint Parameters element in 9.4.2.1
           2. Request an element ID extension for the TWT Constraint Parameters element from the ANA.
           3. Insert the following row in the table 9-130 in 9.4.2.1:
           4. "TWT Constraint Parameters (see 9.4.2.257)", "255", "<ANA>", "Yes", "No"
           5. Note to Editor: Request an Element ID Extension value from ANA to determine <ANA>
           6. At 1452.13, insert the following:
           7. "The Element ID, Length and Element ID extension fields are defined in 9.4.2.1 (General)."
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     2. CID 7194 (MAC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review Context of “key replay counter”.
        3. Proposed Resolution: CID 7194 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-17 16:22:18Z): Replace "local Key Replay Counter field" with "key replay counter" at the cited location.  Replace "Key Replay Counter field" with "key replay counter" at P3091.57.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     3. CID 7202 (MAC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7202 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2024-04-17 16:27:40Z).  Note to the Editor CID 7113 also updates this location (and other similar ones) in this exact fashion.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  5. **PHY Discuss Comment** – Mark RISON (Samsung)
     1. From database
     2. CID 7228 (PHY)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Need to find a DMG expert to find help.
        3. Text was modified by 11ay, so need to ask Sang Kim (LG).
        4. Assigned to Mark RISON
        5. Mark More Work Required
        6. Schedule for May 6 telecon.
     3. CID 7208 (PHY)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Context of first use does not describe the use.
        3. Assign to Mark RISON
        4. Mark More Work Required
        5. Schedule for May 6 telecon
     4. CID 7179 (PHY)
        1. Review comment...
        2. FCC is only for US, not specifically for all North America.
        3. Assign to Edward AU
        4. Mark More Work Required
        5. Schedule for May 6th Telecon
     5. CID 7168 (PHY)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Discussion on if “CMMG OFMD Mode” is a thing?
        3. Assign to Edward AU
        4. Mark More Work Required.
        5. Schedule for May 6th Telecon
        6. Watch for if “field” is added or not. Consistency should be identified.
     6. CID 7123 (PHY)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Discussion on if compliance with the spec should be noted in the draft text itself.
        3. Discussion on if it is appropriate or not.
        4. Need to see if we want to have the testing description in an Annex.
        5. Some believe that the description may be specific for each PHY.
        6. Single Annex may not be best way.
        7. Quality of test equipment has improved dramatically since 2000, and we my not need to really specify test equipment requirements for our standard to work.
        8. Assign to Joseph LEVY
        9. Mark More Work Required.
        10. Schedule for May Interim
        11. Joseph to put on the REVme Reflector for discussion.
  6. **Review doc 11-24/0705r0** – Alfred ASTERJADHI (Qualcomm)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0705-00-000m-cr-for-assigned-cid-on-twt.docx>
     2. CID 7085 (MAC)
        1. Comment has been withdrawn.
        2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7085 (MAC): Rejected. Comment is withdrawn by the commenter.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
     3. CID 7083 and 7084 (MAC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review discussion and proposed changes in the submission.
        3. Discussion of use of next or first.
        4. Discussion on if “NOTE” being added to Clause 9 are not necessary, but just moving the “NOTE” may not be necessary, but rather some normative text added in the other clause.
        5. Assign to Alfred ASTERJADHI
        6. Mark More Work Required.
        7. Schedule for May 6 Telecon
  7. **Review doc 11-24/688** - Brian HART (Cisco)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0688-00-000m-non-ap-regulatory-connectivity-non-comment.docx>
     2. No CID - Non-AP Regulatory Connectivity
     3. The Main Comment from the submission:
        1. An AP device that does not have an IEEE AP at 6 GHz doesn’t need to troubleshoot 6 GHz connectivity issues so doesn’t need to receive a Non-AP STA Regulatory Connectivity element.
        2. We can reasonably infer when an AP device doesn’t have an IEEE AP at 6 GHz from its IEEE APs at 2.4 and 5 GHz, as follows. Typically, all IEEE APs in an AP device have the same MAC/PHY generation. It is overwhelmingly the case that IEEE APs at 5 GHz and 6 GHz in the same AP device have the same MAC/PHY generation. Then the following rule of thumb almost always holds: if an AP device does not include an HE/EHT/… AP at 2.4 and/or 5 GHz, then almost surely that AP device has no IEEE AP at 6 GHz either.
     4. The only change being requested is to add the “HE”.
     5. Discussion on the unintended consequences of this change.
     6. Propose to prepare a motion to include the text to the draft.
     7. Ready for motion, to incorporate the changes in 11-24/0688r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0688-00-000m-non-ap-regulatory-connectivity-non-comment.docx>)
     8. No Objection –Ready for Motion.
  8. **Review doc 11-245/0706** - Brian HART (Cisco)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0706-00-000m-channel-usage.docx>
     2. No CIDs - Channel Usage
     3. Belated Comment:
        1. The Channel Usage element could be sent in a groupcast frame, and so it is desirable that all intended recipients understand the listed operating classes. Then, for wider bandwidths (thinking ahead to 320 MHz), there should be a way to interpret 160 and an adjacent 160 as 320 MHz
        2. The Channel Usage element was designed in an era of 20 MHz and 40 MHz channels in 5 GHz. With 6 GHz, there are many more channels and channel bandwidths, so a way to leverage the wider bandwidths to compress the element is desirable.
        3. Proposed change: add text in 11.21.15 Channel Usage to account for these goals.
        4. Proposed Resolution: 11.21.15 Channel usage procedures

Insert the following text at P2781L53 (after first two paragraphs in this section):

“A Channel Entry field, in a Channel Usage element with Usage Mode equal to 0 or 2, shall be interpreted as a recommendation for the indicated channel, and also for all narrower channels fully encompassed by the bandwidth of the indicated channel.

NOTE – For example, if such a Channel Usage element indicates Global Operating class 128 and Channel 42 (80 MHz at 5 GHz) is a recommendation for that 80 MHz channel, and also for the two 40 MHz channels (36+40, 44+48) and the four 20 MHz channels (36, 40, 44, 48) within that 80 MHz channel.

The operating class(es) included in a Channel Usage element should be selected such that they are expected to be understood by the intended recipient(s) of the element. Channel Entry entries in a Channel Usage element that indicate channels that span a single contiguous bandwidth where the Channel Usage element is sent in a group addressed frame shall be interpreted as a recommendation for each of the identified channels and also for any channel that fully encompasses one or more of the identified channels and is within the contiguous bandwidth.”

* + - 1. Discussion on the concatenation of support to bits to make a simpler indication of supported channels.
      2. Ready for motion, to incorporate the changes in 11-24/0706r0 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0706-00-000m-channel-usage.docx>)
      3. No Objection –Ready for Motion
  1. **MAC AdHoc** – MAC Discuss – Mark HAMILTON (Ruckus/Commscope)
     1. Doc 11-24/0691r1: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0691-01-000m-revme-cids-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
     2. CID 7224 (MAC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. Review context 1554.13.
        3. It was noted that there are 45x "length in octets", so adding this to the cited locations my be a good idea.
        4. Assign to Mark RISON
        5. Mark More Work Required
        6. Schedule for May 6th Telecon
     3. CID 7226 (MAC)
        1. Review comment...
        2. There was an issue implementing the submission into D5.0
        3. CID 6064 –
           1. Editor Notes: ED1: 2023-12-28 01:46:02Z - implemented the first change. Couldn’t find the cited text at the second location (2110.26).
           2. CID 6064 - Resolution: REVISED (MAC: 2023-12-08 20:01:14Z): At the cited location, change to "Immediately after aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime)", and at P2110L26 replace "At aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime) interval" with "Between aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime and aRxTxTurnaroundTime + aAirPropagationTime + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime) interval (see 10.3.2.3.3)".
        4. The editor had email exchange with Brian HART, did not get full resolution.
        5. Brian to look into this for now, we will move on.
     4. CID 7105 (MAC)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Discussion on the use of “ought” and maybe it should be a “should”.
        3. These locations may all be in clause 9, where a “should” should not be used.
        4. Question on if there is a statement someplace else, then we do not need them to be in clause 9.
        5. A Check for each statement would need to be done to ensure if a statement is necessary or not.
        6. We should get feedback from the editors – Publication or IEEE SA Technical Editors.
        7. **ACTION ITEM #2:** Emily QI to check with the Publication and IEEE SA Technical Editors on the use of ought in clause 9 and in NOTES.
        8. These changes were made last July.
        9. The locations are noted in the CID.
        10. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
        11. Mark More Work Required
        12. Schedule for May Interim.
     5. Return to CID 7226 (MAC)
        1. Review where we left off.
        2. This could be a plus 0 to +10% for the variable time.
        3. This is an interval of 0 to 10%, that should be indicated.
        4. Review context page 2213.27.
        5. Discussion on what the text to give the interval information for the equation should be.
        6. Proposed Resolution:

CID 7226 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-17 18:33:18Z):

At P2213.27, replace

"shall begin a SIFS + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime) interval following"

With

"shall begin between a SIFS and a SIFS + 10% × (aSlotTime – aAirPropagationTime) following"

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    1. CID 7150 (MAC)
       1. Review comment...
       2. BSS membership selector has been defined a long time ago.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 7150 (MAC): REJECTED (MAC: 2024-04-17 18:37:59Z): Such a change will render existing 11w-compatible devices non-interoperable.
       4. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion.
    2. CID 7184 (MAC)
       1. Review comment...
       2. Review context p902.19.
       3. Discussion to have the text cleaned up in general, but just removing what is seemingly duplicate description is a good step for now.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Accepted.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    3. CID 7106 (MAC)
       1. Review comment...
       2. Discussion on why there were Editor Notes in D5.0.
       3. There should be a CID for each Editor Note.
       4. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; for insufficient details reason will be used.
       5. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
    4. CID 7142 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review context p1145.25
       3. Assign to Joseph Levy
       4. Mark More Work Required.
       5. Schedule for May Interim.
       6. CID AdHoc Notes:
          1. CID 7142 (MAC): MAC: 2024-04-17 18:51:21Z -   Started to say: REJECTED (MAC: 2024-04-17 18:48:58Z): This paragraph appears within text that discusses reported detected motion, so noting that the details of how such detection is done is appropriate here.  But, considered moving the sentence to a normative clause instead.  MwR, assign to Joseph.  Bring back at May interim.
    5. CID 7063 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. On the agenda for later this week.
       3. 7062, 7063, and 7064 are in 11-24/695 Emily QI.
    6. CID 7151 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Assign to Mark RISON
       3. Mark More Work Required.
       4. Schedule for May 6 telecon.
    7. CID 7159 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Adding statement globally would need to be checked for each instance. Not sure it is a clear global action.
       3. Assign to Mark RISON
       4. Mark More Work Required
       5. Schedule for May Interim
  1. **Recess at 12:01pm**.

1. **REVme AdHoc Wednesday 13:00-15:00**
   1. **Called to order 1:03 pm** by the chair Michael MONTEMURRO
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No issue.
   3. **Review Agenda R5**:
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0626-05-000m-revme-april-2024-adhoc-agenda.docx>
      2. Complete the MAC AdHoc – Discuss CIDs.
      3. Add Emily QI to this Meeting.
      4. No Objection to the plan – will add if time permits.
   4. **MAC AdHoc** – Discuss CID – Mark HAMILTON
      1. CID 7024 (MAC)
         1. Review comment...
         2. What does “support” mean?
         3. Discussion on Support – should be for all “Shall statements”.
         4. How to clearly define “supports”. Mandatory features need to be supported.
         5. Some discussion in 11ba, had a dispute on the use of “supports”.
         6. Discussion on enabled vs implemented or activated.
         7. Discussion on what we may want to define as supported.
         8. Should only the PICs be the location for what is or is not supported.
         9. Assign to Xiafei WANG
         10. Mark More Work Required.
         11. Schedule for May Interim.
   5. **Review doc 11-23/1940r2** – David GOODALL (Morse Micro) presented by Henry PTASINSKI (Element78 Communications LLC/Morse Micro)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1940-02-000m-cid-6053-pv1-comment-resolution.docx>
      2. Abstract:
         1. This submission presents a proposed resolution for the following CIDs: 7012 (was 6053 in SB1) and 7013
         2. The proposed changes are based on REVme/D5.0.
      3. CID 7012 and 7013 (SEC)
         1. Review comment...
         2. Review discussion in submission.
         3. It is believed that there is no existing implementation of PV1.
         4. PTID/ACI will change to PTID for QoS in this change.
         5. Review changes described in the submission.
         6. Concern with neonce with CCMP.
         7. Concern with possible security vulnerability in 11ah.
         8. Research to ensure that the security issue has been resolved.
         9. Un-Protected frames with header compression may be an issue.
         10. Proposed Resolution: CID 7012 and 7013 (SEC): Revised. Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-1940-02-000m-cid-6053-pv1-comment-resolution.docx>
         11. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
   6. **Review doc 11-24/695r1** – Emily QI (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0695-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-sb2-channel-usage-related-cids.docx>
      2. CID 7064 (MAC)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7064 (MAC): ACCEPTED (MAC: 2024-04-17 20:55:23Z).
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
      3. CID 7063 (MAC)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Discussion on proposed changes.
         3. Debate on how the changes should be made. Explicitly listing the capabilities of elements should be included.
         4. Clause 9 should be a generic description for the format, and the other use should be described in another clause other than 9.
         5. The Format section should be generic and then the specific usage and the feature details should be described where that element/frame etc is used elsewhere.
         6. Discussion of a compromise:
            1. Change to The Channel Usage element defines the channel usage information for usage modes in Table 9-268.
         7. Difference of opinion on if the full descriptions of channel usage modes in clause 9 should or should not be included.
         8. Discussion on what a potential straw poll text would be.
         9. Straw Poll #1: What is your preference?
            1. A. Keep the original Text.
            2. B. Delete the sentence.
            3. C. Change the sentence to “The Channel Usage element defines the channel usage information for a BSS or an off channel TDLS direct link.”
            4. D. Change the sentence to “The Channel Usage element defines the channel usage information for usage modes in Table 9-268.”.
            5. E. Change the sentence to “The Channel Usage element provides channel usage for a list of channels.”
            6. Results Straw Poll #1: 1-4-0-1-3
            7. So B and E have some support.
            8. Do a new Straw Poll on just B and E.
         10. Straw Poll #2: What is your preference?
             1. A. Delete the Sentence.
             2. B. Change the sentence to “The Channel Usage element provides channel usage for a list of channels.”
             3. Results: Straw Poll 2: 3 - 4
         11. More Work Required.
         12. Schedule for May Interim.
         13. Action ITEM #3: Emily QI to take the discussion to the reflector to seek consensus for the resolution.
      4. Return to CID 7064 (MAC)
         1. Request to put a reference to the table in the updated text.
         2. Updated Resolution: CID 7064 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-17 21:44:52Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in 11-24/0695r2 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0695-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-sb2-channel-usage-related-cids.docx>), for CID 7064.;
         3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
      5. CID 7062 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7062 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-17 21:49:43Z): Incorporate the changes as shown in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0695-02-000m-proposed-resolution-for-sb2-channel-usage-related-cids.docx>, for CID 7062.
         3. No Objection -- Mark Ready for Motion.
         4. Discussion on if the three bullets should be in the same form or not…the first is “to assist” the other two bullets are “for a STA”. So can we be assisting in all three cases or is the first case should be changed somehow. Leave as is for now.
   7. **Recess at 2:54pm**
2. **REVme AdHoc Wednesday 15:15 to 17:00**
   1. **Called to order** 3:17 pm by the chair Michael MONTEMURRO
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No issue.
   3. **Review Agenda R5:**
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0626-05-000m-revme-april-2024-adhoc-agenda.docx>
      2. No Objection to the plan – will add if time permits.
   4. CID 7031 (MAC)
      1. Withdrawn by Commentor
      2. Proposed Resolution: Rejected; Withdrawn by Commentor
      3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
   5. **Need to modify the Agenda** –
      1. Add Emily QI document.
   6. **Review doc 11-42/696r1** – Emily QI
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0696-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-7079-and-more.docx>
      2. CID 7079 (SEC)
         1. Review Comment.
         2. Describe the figure changes.
         3. The 11az figure was published after the 11ba, and they should not do a replacement, as both groups asked for a replacement.
         4. To add to the confusion, CID 3744 and CID #4077 also made changes to this figure.
         5. The figure that 11az wanted to use is the same as the original 11ba, and so the two CID changes were applied, and so no change is now necessary.
         6. Proposed Resolution: Revised. Remove the Editor Note at line 48 to 50 on page 3077. No change to Figure 12-32 is needed.
      3. CID 7078 (SEC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Relevant texts in D4.0, but no longer exists in D5.0.
         3. Cannot find in D5.0
         4. Assign to Mark RISON
         5. Mark More Work Required
         6. Schedule for May Interim
   7. **Review doc 11-24/690r1 –** Jonathan SEGEV (Intel)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0690-01-000m-cid-7069.docx>
      2. CID 7069 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review context p1023.436
         3. Proposed Resolution: Revise. REVme editor: Insert value of None in the row with OUI equal to 00-0F-AC, suite type equal to 21 (PASN-1).
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
      3. CID 7075 (MAC)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review discussion and proposed changes in submission.
         3. The use of Annex G may not be relevant to update. Need to check.
         4. Editorial changes missed – Raging vs Ranging.
         5. Editorial change makes lower case ranging-poll and ranging-secure-sound.
         6. Review the frame sequences that may or may not be able to be added to the Annex G.
         7. Updates to the sequences were made as they were reviewed.
         8. Annex G history was related. A liaison to REVme from ARC was sent, but the Annex G is informative, future Amendments are not required to update, but not prohibited from updating it.
         9. ARC may be making updates to Annex G.
         10. Annex G is informative, and the details should be somewhere else in the draft.
         11. An Addition to 10.23.2.8 was not able to be done as the list seems to have been left.
             1. This came from REVme CID 109, which incorporated 11-21/1782r6, which deleted a lot of material from 10.23.2.8.)
         12. Assigned to Jonathon SEGEV
         13. Mark More Work Required
         14. Schedule for May Interim.
   8. **CID 7001 - CID 7001 (MAC):** Tomo ADACHI (Toshiba)
      1. Just a verbal report, looking at the comments spreadsheet.
      2. Discussion on the power enablement regulations
      3. Different regulatory domains have different power level limits.
      4. How to describe what is the maximum power limit in the regulatory area.
      5. Need to be aware that some areas are more complicated than other.
      6. The changes is not changing the structure of the frame, but adding details.
      7. Assigned to Tomo ADACHI
      8. Mark More Work Required
      9. Schedule for May Interim.

* 1. **Review doc 11-24/691** – Mark HAMILTON
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0691-01-000m-revme-cids-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
     2. CID 7114 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Review discussion from submission.
        3. Suggest that we restore accidental deletion.
        4. Proposed Resolution: At P2479.51, Add to the start of this paragraph:

“A STA having dot11InternetworkingServiceActivated true may include in the Probe Response frame a CAG”

* + - 1. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  1. **Recessed at 5:58pm**

1. **REVme 2024 April AdHoc – San Diego – Thursday AM1 - April 18, 2024, 10am -12:00 PDT**
   1. **Called to order** 10.04 am MT by the Chair TGme, Michael MONTEMURRO (Huawei).
   2. **Introductions of** Officers present:
      1. Michael MONTEMURRO Huawei, Chair
      2. Mark HAMILTON, Ruckus/CommScope, Vice Chair
      3. Mark RISON, Samsung, Vice Chair
      4. Edward AU, Huawei, Editor
      5. Jon ROSDAHL, Qualcomm, Secretary
   3. **Attendance for Tuesday**: -- IMAT report for someone attending some portion of Tuesday’s meetings:
      1. IMAT Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Au, Kwok Shum | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 2 | Das, Subir | Peraton Labs |
| 3 | Hamilton, Mark | Ruckus/CommScope |
| 4 | Hedayat, Ahmadreza | Apple Inc. |
| 5 | Kim, Youhan | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 6 | Levy, Joseph | InterDigital, Inc. |
| 7 | Malinen, Jouni | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc |
| 8 | McCann, Stephen | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 9 | Montemurro, Michael | Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd |
| 10 | Patwardhan, Gaurav | Hewlett Packard Enterprise |
| 11 | Qi, Emily | Intel |
| 12 | RISON, Mark | Samsung Cambridge Solution Centre |
| 13 | Rosdahl, Jon | Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. |
| 14 | Smith, Graham | SR Technologies |

* + 1. Webex Report on individuals attending that are missing in IMAT Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name | Affiliation |
| 1 | Abhishek Patil | Qualcomm Technologies Inc |
| 2 | George Cherian | Qualcomm Technologies Inc |
| 3 | Yongho Seok | Apple |
| 4 | Neel Nurani Krishnan | Apple |
| 5 | Dong Han | Apple |
| 6 | Sid Thakur | Apple |
| 7 | Jarkko Kneckt | Apple |
| 8 | Yong Liu | Apple |
| 9 | Alfred Asterjadhi | Qualcomm Technologies Inc |
| 10 | Jinjing Jiang | Apple |
| 11 | Dave Halasz | Morse Micro |
| 12 | Xiaofei Wang | InterDigital |
| 13 | Brian Hart | Cisco Systems |
| 14 | Hui Luo | Infineon |

* 1. **Review Patent Policy/Copyright Policy**
     1. No Issues noted.
  2. **Review Agenda**
     1. See Doc 11-24/626r6.
     2. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0626-06-000m-revme-april-2024-adhoc-agenda.docx>
     3. Thursday April 18, 2024 AM1 – 09:00-12:00 PT

a. CID 7059, 7056, 7051 – Qi (Intel)

b. CIDs 7188, 7187, 7107, 7115, 7103, 7116, 7108, 7113 – doc 11-24/691 – Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope)

c. CID 7081, 7077, 7071, 7122, 7121 – doc 11-24/566 – Smith (SRT)

PM1 – 13:00-15:00 PT

a. CID 7195, 7191 – Rison (Samsung)

b. CIDs 7166, 7220, 7199/7200, 7201, 7160, 7213, 7187, 7225 – doc 11-24/702 – Rison (Samsung)

c. CID 7137, 7146 – Levy (Interdigital)

d. CID 7091 – Reza Hedayat (Apple)

PM2 – 15:15-17:00 PT

a. <>

* + 1. Add WANG (Interdigital) CID 7024 to AM1
    2. Edward AU (Huawei) asked for time in PM1:
    3. PM2 – Add Random CID review.
    4. Move Emily to end of AM1.
    5. No Objection to updated Agenda. (see r7)
  1. **Review Document 11-24/691** - Hamilton (Ruckus/Commscope
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0691-01-000m-revme-cids-assigned-to-hamilton.docx>
     2. CID 7188 (GEN) /7187 (GEN)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review discussion in submission.
        3. Proposed resolution: Revised; At P195.1, change the definition of BSA to:

“The area in which the members of a basic service set (BSS) are able to communicate with each other sufficiently to provide the necessary services of the BSS, such as synchronization.

NOTE—The extent of a given BSA is unlikely to be strictly definable, nor static. See 4.3.6 for further discussion.”

* + - 1. Discussion on removing “such as…”.
      2. Discussion on removing “sufficiently”.
      3. Do you have connectivity to provide service, or are you connected if the service is provided.
      4. Discussion for what the final wording should be.
      5. Updated Proposed resolution: CID 7187 (GEN)/7188 (GEN) Proposed Resolution: Revised; At P195.1, change the definition of BSA to:  
         “The area in which the members of a basic service set (BSS) are able to communicate with each other such that necessary services of the BSS can be provided, such as synchronization and data transfer.  
         NOTE—The extent of a given BSA is unlikely to be strictly definable, nor static.  See 4.3.6 for further discussion.”
      6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    1. CID 7113 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review discussion in submission.
       3. Editorial changes were addressed.
       4. Proposed Resolution: CID 7113 (MAC): Revised.  
          At P1971.34, P1971.49, P1972.26, and P1972.43, replace “OMN” with “Operating Mode Notification frame”  
            
          At P4148.44, replace “OMN” with “operating mode notification”  
            
          At P4190.3, replace “OMN” with “Operating Mode Notification”  
            
          Note to Editor: This is aligned with “Accepted” for CID 7202.
    2. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 7107 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review discussion in submission.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 7107 (SEC): Rejected.  There are KCKs for many keys, PTK, SAE, and PASN PTKSA, in addition to TPK.  There is a formal definition (and acronym expansion) for “KCK” as a general concept.  Each of the specific KCKs, are defined locally within their respective specifying subclauses.  There appears no reason to make the TPK-KCK and TPK-TK different, by defining these terms differently and introducing more  
          duplication in the Standard.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    2. CID 7108 need DMG positioning term for 11az – check with Jonathan SEGEV.
    3. CID 7105 - Need help with TDLS - Ask Menzo
  1. **Review document 11-24/696r1** - Emily QI, (Intel)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0696-01-000m-proposed-resolution-for-cid-7079-and-more.docx>
     2. Review CID 7059 (GEN)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review history of the CID.
        3. Motion to resolve in March failed.
        4. Review Style Guide direction.
        5. Review proposed resolution.
        6. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2024-04-18 16:57:43Z)***.*** The CRC reviewed the comment. The motion to  
           approve revised changes (Move Clause 34  
           to a sub-clause of clause 11) failed on 3/14/2024 with  
           the motion result of 6 Yes - 7 No - 4 abstain.   
           The implementing revised changes does not have task group consensus.
        7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     3. CID 7056 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2024-04-18 16:59:07Z). The CRC reviewed the comment. This comment is same as CID 7059.  The motion to approve the resolution for CID 7059 (Move Clause 34 to a sub-clause of clause 11) failed on 3/14/2024 with the motion result of 6 Yes - 7 No - 4 abstain.   
           The implementing proposed changes does not have task group consensus.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
     4. CID 7051 (GEN)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REVISED (GEN: 2024-04-18 17:04:58Z) -; At 4953.1, change the title of clause 34 to “Enhanced broadcast services MAC specification”.
        3. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review doc 11-24/718r0** - Xiaofei WANG (InterDigital)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0718-00-000m-cr-for-cid-7024.docx>
     2. CID 7024 (MAC)
        1. Review Comment
        2. Discussion on what “supports” means or not.
        3. Do we need something that explicitly is supported for HE?
        4. Review how to articulate the meaning of what is or is not supported.
           1. An HE STA supports mandatory... and optional ... which are:
* defined in Clause 26
* defined in Clause 10 and 11, except when the function in 26 supercede
  + - 1. Discussion on how to fully edit the changes.
      2. Concern that this line of changes may cause extending the time for getting the approval for REVme. Comments on this may cause delay.
      3. Suggest getting feedback on this proposed change and bring back to May Interim.
      4. The most likely concern that will be raised is the consistency issue, with other similar occurrences. Can we have something prepared for May that makes this same change to all the "xxx STA supports xxx features" statements.
      5. ACTION ITEM #4; Xiaofei WANG to send email to 802.11 WG and 802.11m Reflector explaining the proposed change and gain feedback for the May Interim addressing the “supports” (HE, HT, VHT, S1G, DMG, EDMG, CMMG) sentences.
      6. Mark More Work Required.
      7. Schedule for May Interim.
  1. **Review Doc 11-24/0721r0** - Edward AU (Huawei)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0721-00-000m-proposed-resolution-to-cid-7168.docx>
     2. CID 7168 (PHY)
        1. Review comment.
        2. Review discussion and proposed changes in submission.
        3. The changes for OFDM mode in Clause 25 and 2 changes in Clause 4. The other locations do not need to be changed.
        4. Other changes would be beyond this comment.
        5. Proposed Resolution CID 7168 (PHY): Revised. Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0721-00-000m-proposed-resolution-to-cid-7168.docx>, for CID 7168.
        6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* 1. **Review state of the agenda** – Graham Smith is not present.
     1. Add Dave HALASZ to Agenda
  2. **Review Doc 11-24/0689r4 -** Dave HALASZ (Morse Micro)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0689-04-000m-cids-7218-7219.docx>
     2. CID 7219 (MAC)
        1. Similar to/related to CID 7218 (ED2?)
        2. Review the proposed changes in the text.
        3. Discussion on the history and feedback from email.
        4. Request for a Straw poll for CID 7219
        5. Suggested straw poll,

For CID 7219 should we do,A) Nothing (Reject)B) Accept changes in 24/689r4 for CID 7219

* + - 1. Results: 5-A 3- B
      2. Discussion on what the actual changes being proposed are included.
      3. The change only changes “indication” to “indicator”.
      4. The changes for 7219 and 7218 are on different figure sets.
      5. Discussion on if the “group addressed” is important to the CID 7219 set of figures.
      6. Discussion on if the figures need to have the arrows adjusted or not.
      7. The Change to just the word “indication” to “indicator”.
      8. Long discussion on if the changes for 7218 and 7219 will leave the draft inconsistent.
    1. Proposed Resolution: Incorporate the changes in 11-24/689r4 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0689-04-000m-cids-7218-7219.docx>) for CID 7219.
       1. After debate, no objection to Mark Ready for Motion
       2. Make 7218 as a separate motion.
  1. **Review doc 11-24/566r3 -** Graham SMITH (SRT Wireless)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0566-03-000m-resolutions-of-cids-7082-7071-7077.docx>
     2. CID 7082 (MAC)
        1. Review comment. – NGV Radio Environment.
        2. Review discussion and changes in submission.
        3. Proposed resolution: CID 7082 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-18 18:44:31Z): Incorporate the changes in 11-24/0566r4 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0566-04-000m-resolutions-of-cids-7082-7071-7077.docx>), for CID 7082.
        4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion

* + 1. CID 7077 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review proposed changes to be made.
       3. Discussion on why we moved the referenced table to clause 11.
       4. We may want to have a bit more discussion on where to put the table.
       5. An Alternative would be to move the table entries to various locations.
       6. Need to track the cross references to this table are correct.
       7. (6.3.128.5.2 page 36 of 11bd).
       8. Assign to Mark HAMILTON
       9. Mark More Work Required
       10. Schedule for April 29 Telecon.
       11. AdHoc Notes: CID 7077 (MAC): MAC: 2024-04-18 18:50:52Z - status set to: More Work Required.  Bring back at April 29.  ACTION: (Mark HAMILTON): Do something with the table in 6.3.128.5.2 (in 11bd), to not need this in clause 6 (and also fix up the cross-references at the same time).
    2. CID 7071 (MAC)
       1. Review Comment
       2. Review the changes that update the references.
       3. Discussion on if the figures are missing or not.
       4. 11az 6.3.53 new subclause. And had a figure. We need to find a place for these figures from the amendments (See CID 7067)
       5. Need to resume discussion after lunch.
  1. Need to discuss CID 7067 which is a problem with being able to roll in 11bc and 11bd due to the Clause 6 reorganization.
  2. **Recess at 12:03pm**

1. **REVme 2024 April AdHoc – San Diego – Thursday PM1 - April 18, 2024, 13:00 -15:00 PDT**
   1. **Called to order 13:02pm**
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No issues noted.
   3. **Review Agenda** that we have left.
      1. Reorder RISON and then SMITH for CID processing.
      2. Non objection to the proposed Agenda.
   4. **Review doc 11-24/702r1** - PHY AdHoc Mark RISON
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx>
      2. CID 7195 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. BSS Configuration may not be well defined.
         3. It may be that the parameter set is not up to date.
         4. ACTION ITEM #5: Mark RISON to send an email to the reflector to ask about BSS Configuration.
         5. Assign to Mark RISON
         6. Mark to More Work Required.
         7. Schedule to May interim
         8. AdHoc Notes: CID 7195 (MAC): More work required. Assign to Mark RISON. Bring back at May interim. ACTION: Mark Rison, to take discussion to the reflector
      3. CID 7191 (SEC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review proposed changes.
         3. Proposed Resolution: CID 7191 (SEC): Revised. Incorporate the changes in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx for CID 7191](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx%20for%20CID%207191)
         4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
      4. CID 7166 (ED1)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Proposed Resolution: CID 7166 (ED1): Revised. Incorporate the changes in [https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx for CID 7166](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx%20for%20CID%207166).
         3. Editor wanted to check about the 4 letter months/abbreviations that may not need to be abbreviated to 3 letters.
         4. Mark Ready for Motion
      5. CID 7199 (GEN) and 7200 (MAC)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review the proposed changes and discussion in submission.
         3. Proposed Resolution:

CIDs 7199 (GEN) and 7200 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-18 20:20:56Z):  
In 9.2.2 Conventions, at the end of the para:  
  
Without further qualification, reception by the MAC sublayer implies that the frame contents are valid, and that the protocol version is supported (see 9.2.4.1.2 (Protocol Version subfield)), with no implication regarding frame addressing or regarding whether the frame type or other fields in the MAC header are meaningful to the MAC entity, where the frame is addressed to the STA (individually addressed or group addressed).(#6185)  
  
add:  
  
Unless explicitly specified, a group addressed frame might or might not, depending on the context, be considered “addressed to” a particular STA.  Additionally, in certain contexts a frame individually addressed to a STA might be considered “received” by another STA (see e.g. 10.3.2.4).

* + - 1. On objection – Mark Ready for Motion.

* + 1. CID 7201 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review the proposed changes and discussion in submission.
       3. Proposed Resolution: CID 7201 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-18 20:23:07Z): At 1786.23 delete “The Block Ack Starting Sequence Control field is set to the corresponding value within the immediately previously received Relay Ack Request frame.”  
            
          At 2365.55 change “Upon reception of a Relay Ack Request frame, the RDS shall respond with a Relay Ack Response frame and set the BlockAck Bitmap field to indicate which frames have been received by the destination REDS.” to “Upon reception of a Relay Ack Request frame, the RDS shall respond with a Relay Ack Response frame with the Block Ack Starting Sequence Control field set to the same value as in the Relay Ack Request frame and the BlockAck Bitmap field set to indicate which frames have been received by the destination REDS.”  
            
          At 674.26 change “The Fragment Number subfield of the Block Ack Starting Sequence Control subfield is set to all 0s” to “The Fragment Number subfield of the Block Ack Starting Sequence Control subfield is set to 0”.
       4. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion.

* + 1. CID 7160 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review the proposed changes and discussion in submission.
       3. Mark More Work Required
       4. Schedule for May Interim
       5. Youhan Asked for some time to review this CID.
       6. AdHoc Notes: CID 7160 (MAC): More Work Required. Revisit at May interim. Assign to Mark RISON. MAC: 2024-04-18 20:27:15Z - status set to: More Work Required.  Bring back at May interim.  (There was a request for more time to review off-line, by Youhan.)
    2. CID 7213 (MAC)
       1. Review comment.
       2. Review the proposed changes and discussion in submission.
       3. Review alternative wording for a solution.
       4. Discussion on sequence number and packet ordering.
       5. Proposed Resolution: CID 7213 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-18 20:38:42Z): Incorporate the changes in  <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx> for CID 7213.
       6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
    3. CID 7225 (GEN) – Not ready for today. – Reschedule for May Interim.
  1. **Review doc 11-24/566r3 -** Graham SMITH (SRT Wireless)
     1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0566-03-000m-resolutions-of-cids-7082-7071-7077.docx>
     2. CID 7121/7122 (GEN)
        1. Review the comment.
        2. Review discussion and proposed changes in submission.
        3. Review Adding Authentication.
        4. Proposed Resolution: CID 7121 and 7122 (GEN): REVISED Incorporate the changes in 11-24/0566r4 (<https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0566-04-000m-resolutions-of-cids-7082-7071-7077.docx> ) for CIDs 7121 and 7122 (GEN).
        5. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion
  2. **Review CID 7067 (GEN)** – Emily QI
     1. This comment deals with the inability of being able to roll in 11az, 11bd and 11bc due to the Clause 6 reorganization.
     2. Doc 11-23/2077r0 back in October that addresses this problem.
        1. Consider document: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-2077-00-000m-changes-to-clause-6-for-11az-2022.docx>
        2. Review document on dealing with 11az.
        3. CID 7121 and 7122 addressed 11bd and 11bc.
        4. Review the FTM changes – they were removed (not added in roll-in)
        5. These included figures and they seemed to be duplicated, so some figures were removed, and Mark HAMILTON took an action to review and see if they need to come back.
        6. The Changes from document 11-23/2077r0 is included in D5.0
        7. There is a need to put Minimum Required Secure HE-LTF Version as a parameter for Primitives – FINETIMINGMSMTRQ.request and FINETIMINGMSMTRQ.indicate.
        8. Review 11bd Clause 6
           1. They had discussion on which CID covered which amendment. We reviewed the different Amendments to determine what is mssing to roll-in.
           2. 11bd added a 6.5.126. Joseph to check on how it needs to be mapped into the new d5.0 clause 6. – Radio environment.
        9. This discussion as hard to follow, but need to work out how the three Amendments are mapped into the Clause 6.
        10. Looking at 11bc, these need to be moved to Clause 6.5
            1. 6.3.129 -> 6.5.?? – Full details - Graham
            2. 6.3.130 -> Table in 6.4 – determine type (Type 3)
            3. 6.3.131 -> Table in 6.4 – (Type 1)
            4. 6.3.132 -> 6.5.?? – Full details.
        11. Looking at 11bb
            1. No clause 6.
     3. *Post meeting notes from Emily QI (Intel)*

***802.11az standard:***

6.3.5: covered by CID 7121

6.3.56: Mark H will bring a submission for the roll-in instruction of 6.3.56. @mark.hamilton2152

***802.11bd standard:***

6.3.126: Joe will bring a submission for the roll-in instruction of 6.3.126. @Joseph Levy

6.3.127: covered by CID 7082

6.3.128: covered by CID 7077, and Mark H has an action item for a table in 6.3.128.5 MLME-OCB-DMGDISCOVERY.indication . @mark.hamilton2152

***802.11bc standard:***

6.3.129 to 6.3.132: Graham will bring a submission for the roll-in instruction of subclauses 6.3.129 to 6.3.132. @'Smith, Graham'

* + 1. The Clause 6 changes will need to be discussed as the first item at the May Interim.
  1. **Review CID 7091(MAC)** – Reza HEDAYAT, Apple
     1. CID 7091
        1. Review comment.
        2. Discussion of the comment.
        3. Support for the change and objections to the change were exchanged.
        4. Marked as More Work Required
        5. Schedule for May Interim
  2. **Recess 15:02pm PDT**

1. **REVme 2024 April AdHoc – San Diego – Thursday PM2 - April 18, 2024, 15:15 -17:00 PDT**
   1. **Called to order 15.16pm** PDT by the chair, Michael Montemurro (Hauwei)
   2. **Review Patent Policy**
      1. No Issues.
   3. **Review Agenda**
      1. CID 7137, 7146, 7220, 7217
      2. Random CIDs afterward.
      3. No Objection to plan.
   4. CID 7137 and 7146 – Reschedule for May 6 telecom.
   5. **Review doc 11-24/702r1** Mark RISON (Samsung)
      1. <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-01-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx>
      2. CID 7220 (ED1)
         1. Review comment.
         2. Review discussion and proposed changes in submission.
         3. Discussion on the changes and some editorial changes were requested.
         4. Concern with the change at 4911.21 of changing a “can” to “shall”.
         5. We may have only 2 choices so a ”can” may be the right choice.
         6. Proposed Resolution: CID 7220 (ED1): Revised. Incorporate the changes in ttps://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx for CID 7220
         7. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
      3. CID 7217 (MAC)
         1. Review Comment
         2. Review discussion and proposed changes in submission.
         3. Discussion on extended sleep modes.
         4. Discussion on the use of “shall” being associated with the sleep modes.
            1. Page 2504 (there were several “Shall” that could be “Should”.
            2. Then after further discussion, we determined that they should be “Shall”.
         5. Proposed Resolution: CID 7217 (MAC): REVISED (MAC: 2024-04-18 22:57:07Z): Incorporate the changes in <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/24/11-24-0702-02-000m-resolutions-for-some-comments-on-11me-d5-0-sa2.docx> for CID 7217.
         6. No Objection – Mark Ready for Motion
   6. Revisit CID 7218/7219 (ED2)
      1. Discussion on the use of the figure.
      2. Discussion on the use of the name group addressed traffic indicator.
      3. Review new attempt for a replacement figure.
      4. Discussion on the misalignment of the field names – see page 904. – nonTxBSS ID.
         1. "and are called NonTxBSS identifiers (NonTxBSS IDs)."
      5. There were maybe only 2 figures that needed to be updated.
      6. L4, L5, L6, L7 would need to be updated.
      7. Mark RISON to coordinate with Dave HALASZ to bring back for discussion.
      8. Abhi to make a submission that coordinates the text that references the figures.
   7. CID 7003 (GEN)
      * 1. Review Comment
        2. Proposed Resolution: REJECTED (GEN: 2024-04-18 23:37:02Z) The use of "non" is an unfortunately necessary naming convention that differentiates legacy features that are not included in the new features.
        3. No objection – Mark Ready for Motion.
   8. **Adjourned 4:39 pm EDT**